

Remarks

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13 and 15-22 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 13 and 15 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Applicants have amended claims 13 and 15 to clarify that the computer readable medium is non-transitory. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 13 and 15 and claims dependent thereon comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication 2003/200058 to Ogawa et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,577,988 to Travagline et al. The Examiner rejected claims 4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Travagline et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 7,120,830 to Tonack. The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Travagline et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,006,171 to Vines et al. The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Travagline et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 7,120,830 to Tonack.

The combination of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22 since, among other things, the combination does not

suggest a method that includes selecting by a maintenance user using a hand-held or wearable portable computing device an equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying on the portable computing device at least information about a new event or an alarm for the selected equipment, plant or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process to the maintenance user, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and establishing contact by the maintenance user with at least one internal user or at least one external user about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm. Ogawa et al. only suggests access of a maintenance worker to drawings and instruction manuals. On the other hand, Travagline et al. only suggests sending an alarm message to notify people of an alarm. Travagline et al. does not suggest that if those who receive the alarm establish contact with at least one internal user or at least one external user about a selected equipment, plant or process if the person receiving the alarm cannot address a new event or alarm, and providing of information to the person receiving the alarm by the at least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm. There is no suggestion in either of Ogawa et al. or Travagline et al. that a person receiving notification of an alarm or event would establish contact with an internal or external party to obtain information regarding the event or alarm. On the other hand, the claimed invention can identify internal and/or external people with technical information, experience and/or training about addressing the event or alarm. By carrying out these further steps, the claimed invention can more rapidly and accurately address events and alarms that arise when a maintenance user cannot address the event or alarm.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22. Therefore, the combination of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. does not make obvious the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18 since, among other things, Tonack does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. Along these lines, Tonack does not suggest a method that includes selecting by a maintenance user using a hand-held or wearable portable computing device an equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying on the portable computing device at least information about a new event or an alarm for the selected equipment, plant or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process to the maintenance user, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and establishing contact by the maintenance user with at least one internal user or at least one external user about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm. The Examiner asserts that Tonack at col. 7, lines 4-26, suggests contacting an external user or expert. However, this passage only suggests checking on service calls and sending service calls. Tonack does not suggest a maintenance user retrieving information for use in addressing an alarm or event and contacting an external user or expert to obtain additional information to use in addressing an event or alarm. Tonack only suggests

accessing information regarding whether a repair was carried out and when. No technical data is retrieved or supplied by an external user or expert.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18. Therefore, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Tonack does not make obvious the invention recited in claims 4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 8 and 21 since, among other things, Vines et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. Along these lines, Vines does not suggest a method that includes selecting by a maintenance user using a hand-held or wearable portable computing device an equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying on the portable computing device at least information about a new event or an alarm for the selected equipment, plant or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process to the maintenance user, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and establishing contact by the maintenance user with at least one internal user or at least one external user about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm. Vines et al. only suggests a system to manage maintenance orders. Additionally, Vines et al. does not suggest a portable computing device. Rather, Vines et al.

only suggests, "selection of process control monitoring station, association of equipment tag names in the maintenance database with process control variables", which does not suggest selecting by a maintenance user using a hand-held or wearable portable computing device one of the equipment, plant or process.

Vines et al. does not suggest retrieving contact information for internal users having technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process, and contacting the internal users about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information. Vines et al. only suggests an operator who generates maintenance work orders, as described at col. 5, line 57, through col. 6, line 2. This operator does not appear to be a maintenance user who would employ information associated with the selected equipment, plant or process nor an internal user having technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process. Also, the "crew assigned to do the work" is not an internal user having technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process. At most the "crew" might include the claimed maintenance user. Vines et al. does not suggest retrieving information including maintenance information and technical information for use in addressing an event or alarm associated with selected equipment, plant or process. Simply displaying a maintenance issue and other maintenance issues does not suggest displaying information used to solve the maintenance issues.

Furthermore, Vines et al. also does not suggest configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the selected equipment, plant or process, the software entity including links to information regarding all equipment, plant, process monitored

and controlled by the control systems. Vines et al. only suggests a line between a process variable and a piece of equipment. Also, Vines et al. does not suggest links to information regarding all equipment, plant, or process monitored and controlled by the control systems. Additionally, Vines et al. only suggests generating work orders, tracking work orders, and checking a status of work orders.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines does not suggest the invention recited in claims 8 and 21. Therefore, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines does not make obvious the invention recited in claims 8 and 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al., Vines and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9 and 10 since, among other things, Tonack does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines. Along these lines, Tonack does not suggest a method that includes selecting by a maintenance user using a hand-held or wearable portable computing device an equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying on the portable computing device at least information about a new event or an alarm for the selected equipment, plant or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process to the maintenance user, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and establishing contact by the maintenance user with at least one internal user or at least one external user about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal user or at least one external user

to address the new event or alarm. The Examiner asserts that Tonack at col. 7, lines 10-4, suggests configuring equipment, plant or process with an identity of an internal user. However, this passage only suggests listing maintenance calls in a particular location or relating to a particular type of production equipment. This passage does not suggest configuring equipment, plant or process with an identity of an internal user with which a maintenance user may establish contact if the maintenance user cannot address a new event or alarm. Tonack only suggests accessing information regarding whether a repair was carried out and when. Tonack does not suggest retrieving or supplying technical data by an external user or expert associated with an equipment, plant or process.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al., Vines and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9 and 10. Therefore, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al., Vines and Tonack does not make obvious the invention recited in claims 9 and 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 27, 2010

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300